

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

NERU-NERI AASEKHEMU-ALI,

Petitioner,

Case Number: 2:11-CV-12537

v.

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

MS. BECK,

Respondent.

_____ /

ORDER OF SUMMARY DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Petitioner Neru-Neri Aasekhemu-Ali is incarcerated at the William Dickerson Detention Center in Hamtramck, Michigan. Petitioner has filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Because the Court cannot discern the grounds on which Petitioner seeks habeas corpus relief, the Court summarily dismisses the petition without prejudice.

Rule 4, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, provides that a district court may enter an order for the summary dismissal of a habeas corpus petition “[i]f it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court. . . .” A petition may be summarily dismissed where the allegations are so “vague (or) conclusory” that they do not “point to a real possibility of constitutional error.” *Blackledge v. Allison*, 431 U.S. 63, 76 (1977) (internal citations omitted). “[A] claim for relief in habeas corpus must include reference to a specific federal constitutional guarantee, as well as a statement of the facts which

entitle the Petitioner to relief.” *Gray v. Netherland*, 518 U.S. 152, 162-63 (1996) (internal citations omitted). *See also Perez v. Hemingway*, 157 F. Supp. 2d 790, 796 (E.D. Mich. 2001) (“A petition for a writ of habeas corpus must set forth facts that give rise to a cause of action under federal law or it may summarily be dismissed.”).

Petitioner lists four grounds for relief, the first three of which state, in their entirety: “See Doc. No. 254 and 255, 258 and 259, see also 246 and 247.” Petition at 6. The fourth claim is identical to the first three, with the exception that it does not include “see also 246 and 247.” This brief listing of numbers fails to set forth any specific claims for habeas relief. Thus, the Court cannot determine the nature of Petitioner’s habeas claims.

The Court, therefore, **DISMISSES** the petition for a writ of habeas corpus without prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 23, 2011

S/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on June 23, 2011, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also to eru-Neri Aasekhemu-Ali at William Dickerson Detention Center, 3501 Hamtramck Drive Unit H-3, Hamtramck, MI 482111.

S/Josephine Chaffee
Deputy Clerk

